

April 24, 1975

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, section 8 is the retroactive, supposed retroactive clause, that future increases would be allowed to people who were injured in the past. I think if we're going to cheat on one end that we should give them something on the other end. This amendment should be adopted. It should have probably remained in the original bill. What it would provide is that if you decide to give them \$100.00 this year and \$101.00 next year, that a person injured this year would get \$101.00. It does not go back of effect any person previously injured or injured before this bill would become effective, but all people injured in the future, when an increase was granted, they would be brought up with the existing increase. There is no other way that a person who is living under disability can cope with increases in the cost of living. It makes absolutely no sense to say that because you're injured in a given year, and that compensation was such in that given year, you should forever be required to live on that level of compensation. A man could have lived on \$55.00 per week ten years ago, it's obvious that he can't live on \$55.00 a week today. If we're going to say that a man is going to get \$100.00 today, he obviously won't be able to live on \$100.00 ten years from now if we assume that inflation will continue as it does. This is a fair thing to do. It's actuarially sound. As the rate increases, it will be built into the premium and it should be adopted.

SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes Senator Dickinson.

SENATOR DICKINSON: I'm certainly not an authority....Mr. President, members of the body, I would hope that Senator Cavanaugh would be gracious in allowing the bill to proceed at some, what he would consider, an unreasonable compromise. You put this clause back in here, it no doubt is going to kill a bill. If that's what he wants, well, that's what we'll probably get.

SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes Senator Stull.

SENATOR STULL: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I don't really see how this would work because a lot of times you have people that's carrying compensation insurance and they may go out of business, who would assume the premiums because the fellow that had originally paid the premiums would no longer be in business. Now, if this is big companies, this is no problem, but you have a lot of smaller businesses that comes under compensation insurance and a lot of times they change ownership and I think you'd have a real problem.

SPEAKER: Any further discussion. If not, Senator Cavanaugh, do you wish to close?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: I would just close by saying to Senator Dickinson that graciousness on my part does not include abandoning my convictions.

SPEAKER: Would the Clerk read the Cavanaugh amendment.